



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing the same umlaut are: *hégan* (O.N. *heyia*) <**haujan*, and *strégan*, Goth. *straujan*, pret. *strawida*. The W.S. gave up its corresponding **stríegan*, and leveled the verb to its pret. *strewede*. Therefore the *éa* of *ðréan*, *sméan* must be the contraction of the umlauted vowel with the suffix vowel. That is: *ðréan* <**ðrie(j)an*; *sméan* <**smie(j)an*, just as *héan* <**hiehan* > **hauhjan*. Sievers, §408,4.

Similarly *fréa* <**frie(j)a* (cf. *frígea*). By the side of *íewan*, *ýwan* occurs in W.S. *éowan*, which according to Sievers, §408,2 is not umlauted. This word is the same as Goth. *augjan*, O.H.G. *ougen*, M.H.G. (*z*-)*ougen*, *z-ounen*, etc., and is further related to Goth. *augō*, etc., O.H.G. *awi-zorah*t *ouga-zorah*t.

The diphthong *éo* in *éowan* cannot possibly go back to a Germ. *au(g)u-*, whether umlauted or not, but it can originate in *a(g)u-*, as Paul, *Beiträge* vi, 97, points out. Now since post consonantal *u* dropped before *īō* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii, §110) the original form of our verb was **agjan*, pret. **ajida*. By leveling and contamination of *ag-* and *au-* arose Goth. *augjan*, *augida*. But in O.E. the other development was generalized, giving **aujan* (or perhaps rather *auwjan*, Kögel, *Beiträge*, ix, 526) pret. **awida*. From these developed *íewan*, **ewede* > *éow(o)de*, with the spreading of both forms. With *au-* <*a(g)u-* (not *au(g)u-*) are formed O.H.G. *awi-zorah*t, M.H.G. *z-ounen*, M. L. Franc. *t-ōnen*, etc. On the confusion of *ag-* and *au-* cf. Osthoff, *Beiträge*, viii, 261, ff; Brugmann, *Grundr.* i, §444, Anm. 3; Franck, *Et. Wrdb.* sub *oog* and *toonēn*. The *éa* of the dialectic *éawan* is probably for *éo*. From this standpoint, therefore, there is no difficulty in deriving these words from the I.E. √ *oq-* in Gk. *ὄψ*, *ὄσσε*, Lat. *oculus*, etc.

There is probably a similar contamination in *éagor*, "sea, eagre," either for an original **agor* or **ægor*, cf. O.N. *Æger* <**āgia-*. The influencing word was doubtless *éa*, so that the change was comparatively late.

2. Here belong: *blāwan*, *clāwan*, *cnāwan*, *crāwan*, *māwan*, *sāwan*, *ðrāwan*, *wāwan*; *blōwan*, *flōwan*, *grōwan*, *hlōwan*, *rōwan*, *spōwan*.

In O.E. these verbs belong to the so-called reduplicating verbs. Similarly conjugated are Goth. *saian*, *waian*; O.N. *sá*; a few forms of

O.H.G. *blāan*, and of O.S. *sāian*, *thrāan*, *biknēgan*. Otherwise these verbs have become weak in these dialects. The reason for this is not far to seek. The most of them go back to presents formed from the root +*ē*+*īo-*, and +*ō*+*īo* (or *ā*+*īo*). Cf. Brugmann, ii, §739. Falling together in form with the causatives and denominatives, they became weak like so many other *īo-* presents.

But in O.E. there is no trace of a *j*. How is this to be explained? Sievers, §62, assumes that the *āw* in O.E. *blāwan*, etc., comes from *aiw*, comparing Goth. *saian*, *waian*, and the development seen in Goth. *snaiws*, *aiw*: O.E. *snāw*, *ā*. But the two cases are not parallel. In *saiws* the *ai* is a real diphthong, but in *saian* the *ai* represents I.E. *ē*. Cf. Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi, 51 ff. In O.H.G. the development was *blāu* <**blāju* <*blāīō* <*bhl-ē-īō*; and similarly *bluoīu* <*bhl-ō-īō*. This ought to give in O.E. **blāwe* and **blāwe*. The *w* is merely a transition-sound, and could not have developed while a *j* stood between the vowels. But it has already been shown that *j* standing between vowels does not disappear without causing umlaut. Nor can we assume a contraction *ē+ī>ā*; *ō+ī>ō*. Hence the only explanation possible is to adopt that given by Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi, 73, for Goth. *saia* <**sēō* <**sēmi*. Cf. also Möller, *Anz. f. d. A.* xx, 119.

These verbs, then, like the dissyllabic verbs of the same class had the athematic and the *īo-* inflection side by side. In O.E. the *īo-* inflection was crowded out, unless we except *sāēwan*, which may be an umlauted form. Without *īo-* inflection are also O.N. *sá*, *klá*, (but also *klēia*) *gróa*, *róa*. In O.H.G. all these verbs eventually generalized the *īo-* inflection.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

THE POSITION OF THE SECONDARY ACCENT IN FRENCH ETYMONS having more than the two Pretonic Syllables. I.

IN 1876,¹ Mr. Darmesteter announced his solution of the treatment in French of the pro-

¹ *Romania* v., pp. 141-164. Reprinted in *Reliques Scientifiques* ii, pp. 95-119. Paris 1890.

tonic² syllable, a solution which has been regarded ever since as the standard explanation of this difficult question. His conclusions, known as "Darmesteter's Law" and having reference to the protonic syllable when not initial, and not followed by two consonants constituting checked position, were as follows: The tonic accent divides the word into two halves, and the final vowels of these two halves are subject to laws of like nature. These laws for the protonic are:

1. *a* remains usually as *e*; this *e*, when after a liquid or a vowel, generally falls at a later period:
2. All other vowels fall, or, if a supporting vowel is needed, become *e*. Certain groups of consonants not requiring a supporting vowel when final, do require it when protonic, on account of the additional influence of the sounds which follow. The examples given of such groups are: *nt-gr*,³ *r-gr*,³ *nt-t*,⁴ *tr-c*,⁵ *st-t* *tr-t*.⁵ *v-r*, *v-l* have a tendency to require a supporting vowel:⁶
3. If the protonic vowel is in hiatus with the tonic, the preceding vowel is the true protonic; its treatment, however, varies in some respects from that of an ordinary protonic.⁷

The reason given for this law of protonics is that on four-syllable words there is a secondary accent upon the first syllable; that the word is then considered as being made up of two parts, and the last syllable of each part is influenced in the same way by the accent which precedes it.

It is to be noted that the law as expressed does not include the cases where there are more than two pretonic syllables. What is the position of the secondary accent in these words, and its effect on the adjacent syllables?

² Mr. Darmesteter uses the terms *pretonic* and *protonic* in different senses. The protonic syllable is that pretonic syllable which directly precedes the tonic. This useful distinction in nomenclature seems to have been neglected by other writers with the exception of Prof. Meyer-Lübke. Cf. his *Grammaire des Lang. Rom.* i, p. 290. §341.

3 Darmesteter, *Rom.* v., p. 147.

4 Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 149.

5 Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 156.

6 Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 148.

7 Darmes., *l. c.*, pp. 162-163.

On this point we have a diversity of views limited, apparently, only by the number of Old-French grammars which have appeared, and of plausible theories which can be suggested. The following are the theories:

1. Darmesteter, in the article already referred to,⁸ expresses himself as in doubt concerning the position of the secondary accent. In his grammar,⁹ however, which appeared fifteen years later, he states that, beginning at the tonic accent and moving back, each second syllable receives a secondary accent.
2. Meyer-Lübke¹⁰ is of the opinion that the secondary accent is initial.
3. Schwan¹¹ holds that the secondary accent is on the second pretonic syllable when this is long by nature or position, otherwise on the third. A mute and a following liquid are counted as making a vowel position-long. Composita, when felt as such, are not accented on the first element.¹²
4. Suchier, in *Le Français et le Provençal*,¹³ passes over the question altogether.

Thus we have complete disagreement, yet no one of the writers mentioned has given reasons for his conclusions. The chronological order in which these views appeared is:

Initial accent, 1890 (Meyer-Lübke);

Binary accent, 1891 (Darmesteter);¹⁴

Same system as that of the Classic Latin for main accent, 1888 (Schwan);

Reaffirmed in his new edition, 1893.¹⁵

⁸ Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 164, note 1.

⁹ *Grammaire Historique* i, §41.

¹⁰ *Gr. des Lang. Rom.* i, §341, and *Zeit. f. Fr. Sp. und Lit.* xv (1893), p. 88.

¹¹ *Altfranz. Gram.*, First edition (1888), §47; second edition (1893), §53.

¹² The statement of his theory for the position of the secondary accent is the same in both editions, save that in the second he leaves out the explicit statement made in the first that hiatus *i, e* count as a syllable in determining the place of the accent. That he still holds this view, however, is shown by his marking the secondary accent in one such word, *Comparatione*.

¹³ Cf. §10.

¹⁴ This, of course, does not count as a later view than the preceding, since Prof. Darmesteter died in 1888.

¹⁵ Still a fourth theory might be suggested, though, so far as I know, no effort has been made to explain the French forms solely by it; it might be said that the secondary accent arose altogether from analogy, and that, for example, *nidificare* had an accent on the first syllable because of *nidus*.

Since there is such a conflict in the views of scholars touching this subject, and yet the arguments on which they based these views are wanting, I deemed it worth while to seek the solution, even though results, if any should be attained, would probably only corroborate some view already announced. I, therefore, collected all French words I could find with etymons having three or more pretonic syllables,¹⁶ my main source being Gustav Körting's *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch*. This list is probably about complete, with the exception of proper names, which Körting does not give.

After we exclude learned or loan words from the collection thus made, not all the rest are available as the foundation of an argument on the nature of their etymons, since simpler forms occur for a large number, built on the same root, and with an exactly corresponding stem in the French. Here the probability of influence exercised is so great that such words are absolutely worthless as testimony upon the nature of the forms from which they are derived. From the group which remains—the only competent witnesses in the case—I believe we can draw a satisfactory conclusion, as follows:

The secondary accent is initial save in words easily recognized as composita; there it is on the first syllable of the second element.

If we accept this statement not only do the examples range themselves satisfactorily under it, but it is in harmony with the Latin background of the words. The fact of initial accent in the Old Latin is definitely established. Now, in a language with strong accentuation it is very probable, if not absolutely necessary, that long words have a minor accent in addition to the main stress. Prof. Lindsay in his

Such an explanation would be incomplete and unsatisfactory, for it would be necessary to find shorter forms, accented on the proper syllable, not alone for all words with more than two pretonic syllables, but also for the words covered by Darmesteter's Law. It is not, however, at all unreasonable to suppose that in some instances such simpler Latin forms may have had influence, though I have not found it necessary to make this assumption in any case.

¹⁶ In the appendix I add all the words not discussed in the body of the paper, with the exception of words that are clearly loan or learned forms.

new work, the *Latin Language*,¹⁷ suggests¹⁸ that while the main accent was still initial, there must have already been a secondary accent on the penult or antepenult, and that the later accent was a mere change of the relative strength of the two accents. According to this view the initial secondary accent existed in the Classic Latin. We have nothing to disprove this; on the other hand, if it be shown that the Saturnian verse is accentual and not quantitative—a point still in dispute¹⁹—the presence of the secondary accent will be proved for the period in which it was written. However this may turn out, it is an argument in favor of the initial position of the secondary accent that it corresponds to the Old-Latin accentuation.²⁰

The fact of Folk-Latin recomposition is well known; for *displicet* we have *displācet*, for *reddidit*, *reddēdit*, etc., with the original vowel retained and the accent on the second member of the compositum. Along with the tendency for the tonic accent to leave the first member, a similar tendency would naturally exist for the secondary accent. Thus the Latin accentuation is favorable to both points of the system of accent proposed.

In entering upon an examination of the subject before us, I had no bias toward any one of the theories given, or toward any theory, yet since Prof. Darmesteter's main conclusions in his article on the protonic in French are so clearly correct, I followed the plan of investigation that his line of reasoning suggested. If, as he puts it,²¹ the tonic accent divides a word into two halves, and the final syllables of these halves undergo similar

¹⁷ *The Latin Language; an historical account of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions*, by Wm. Lindsay, M. A., Oxford, 1894.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

¹⁹ Lindsay, *l. c.* p. 159, and *American Journal of Phil.*, 1893, pp. 139-170.

²⁰ The doubling of a consonant, originally single, occurs, for the Italian, in a majority of cases after the accented syllable. In a number of cases this doubling also takes place after the first vowel of a long word; for example, *accademia*, *camminare*, etc. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gram.*, p. 154, §267; D'Ovidio, *Romania* vii, pp. 199-211; and Schuchardt, *Romania* vii, pp. 104-105. This may indicate the persistence of an initial secondary accentuation in Italian territory.

²¹ *l. c.*, pp. 163-164.

changes, due to their corresponding relations to the two accents, then in words with three pretonic syllables, in case accent is initial, we should surely look for an absolute reduction of the intermediate syllable corresponding to the universal fall (for French) of unaccented penults. Certainly the influence of the secondary accent would not be transferred with almost annihilating force to the last syllable of its group and yet fail to affect the intermediate syllable. If, on the other hand, the accent is binary and the secondary accent falls on the second syllable, then this second syllable should maintain itself absolutely.

I applied this system of reasoning to the words I had collected, but the results were not conclusive. Some cases contradicted an absolute fall of the second pretonic syllable; for example, **crudalitem* > *cruauté*, **minžsterarium* > *menžstrier*, **ligamenarium* > *liemier*, etc.²² Certain cases, on the other hand, indicated a weakening of the syllable in question; as, **arboriscellum* > *arbroissel*, **nidificare* > *nicher*, etc.

Schwan's theory proved much more pliable; for working proposes as a practical test it seemed to meet our wants, but a difficulty arises here from the small number of the words at our command. The theory occupies a middle ground, accenting in some cases one, in certain cases the other of the syllables in dispute, and thus reducing by one half the number of words available as testimony in favor of either of the other theories as opposed to it. Looking at Schwan's view from the positive side, the testimony in favor of it is similarly halved, and a few coincidences²³ could explain away the little existing positive evidence in favor of the system of accentuation. Had this theory been intrinsically probable, I might have accepted it and called for proof that the agreement is mere coincidence, but a theory that counts a mute plus a liquid as making the preceding vowel long; that treats a single word exactly as if it were two independent words; and that, in addition, is the most cumbersome of the views proposed,

cannot be accepted absolutely on the strength of only a half dozen words.

Thus my results were unsatisfactory. I had either to give up the problem or to find a better point of view from which to consider it. I returned to my point of departure, Darmesteter's Law. This law is undoubtedly true; but why is it that the fall of this protonic vowel occurs? The reason assigned is, that after the word is divided into two parts, the protonic is then a final²⁴ and is treated as such, falling after the preceding accent. This is an arbitrary assumption. The protonic syllable is not really a final syllable, and while it stands in the same relation to the secondary accent as the final syllable to the tonic accent, is it not after all a mistake to treat it as if final; for when the tonic accent has such a powerful influence over the syllables which follow it, practically reducing them to nothing, why should it not exercise some influence over the preceding syllable? We find actual cases within the Romance field where protonic vowels disappear before the accent even when initial. Instances occur in the Piedmontese dialect: for example, *tle=telažo*, *dne=danažo*, *vzin=vecino*; and in the Emilian also: *klomb=colombo*, *dmeng=domenica*, *tsved<dissipatus*, etc.²⁵ It is perfectly natural, however, that the influence of the accent should be greater and extend farther over what follows than over what precedes it, since its influence over preceding syllables is anticipatory. Where the preceding syllable is the initial syllable of the word, this would tend to prevent its being slurred over or neglected. The great majority of words in which the protonic syllable is not initial have two pretonic syllables. In such words the protonic is directly between the tonic and the secondary accent. The fact of its being before the strong tonic accent must have had an effect at least as great as that caused by its being just after the weaker secondary accent. Thus, it is the conjoined effect of the two that causes the fall; not, as has been heretofore claimed, the influence of the secondary accent alone. When we have more

²² The whole list of examples will be considered in full further on.

²³ How such coincidence could arise will be shown below, col. 375, line 14, ss.

²⁴ Mr. Darmesteter in his *Grammaire Historique* calls the non-initial protonic syllable the "counter-final;" vol. i, p. 85, §48.

²⁵ Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gr.*, §127.

than two pretonic syllables, the fall of the pro-tonic vowel is just as regular, while there is at least a tendency for the preceding syllable to remain. Granted the secondary accent is initial, this seems²⁶ to indicate that the stronger influence is that of the principal accent.

If then our reasoning is correct;

1. The secondary accent is initial, save in composita easily recognizable as such;
2. The protonic vowel falls at least as much on account of its proximity to the tonic accent as because of its proximity to the secondary accent.

The second pretonic syllable, being next after the secondary accent, should probably show signs of weakening, but since it is separated from the tonic accent, it need have no such absolute tendency to fall as that which the protonic exhibits. Since even the protonic is preserved as *e* when surrounded by consonants demanding a supporting vowel, certainly* as much should be expected of the second pretonic. This helps to explain the completeness with which Schwan's law seems to cover the examples, for when the second pretonic vowel is followed by two consonants, *e* is required as a supporting vowel. It so happens that in a majority of cases the original vowel is *e* or *ɣ*, and the supporting vowel seems to Schwan to be the original vowel retained because it is "long by position," and hence the accent rests upon it.

I have not spoken of the words which can only be considered as having three pretonic syllables, if we count a hiatus vowel as making a separate syllable. If we accept the theory of initial accentuation, the hiatus vowel in these words in no way affects, of course, the position of the secondary accent. It has, however, been long since definitely settled that in the development of French words this hiatus vowel does not count as a syllable. All these words, therefore, are excluded from our consideration.

In order to simplify my statement, I have heretofore deferred a general citation of words, so that they may all be considered together. From the list that follows I have excluded

²⁶ I thus limit my statement because the fall of the pro-tonic in such words might be explained by analogy to the far greater number of words with only two pretonic syllables.

learned or loan words, and compounds having in French a simpler form exactly corresponding to the original of compound;²⁷ for example, *remouliner*; cf. *moulin*. Excepting such words, the list contains all I have collected.

1. *Words in which the second pretonic syllable does not disappear, and which, therefore, include all that might seem to favor binary accent.*

**Exaequaculare*—*égailer*, **matricularium*—*marreglier*.

If we reject the anaptyctic *ɨ* in these words, the *a* and *i* are really the protonic syllables in each case; and even apart from this, the *a*, being the vowel most capable of resistance, would be expected to remain as *a* or *e*, while the *tr* of the second word requires a supporting vowel.

**Crudalitem*—*cruauté*, **ligaminarium*—*liemier* (Old Fr.), *paraveredum*—*palafreid*²⁸ or *palefreid*.

The *a* in these words remains, as is to be expected. *Paraveredus* should perhaps be excluded, since the only two other cases of *fr* representing *vr* are initial, and this may indicate that the word developed in two parts. The form *palafreid*, however, would contradict this supposition.

**Ministerialem*—*menestral*, **ministerarium*—*menestrier*.

Here *n-st* requires the supporting *e*.

Imp̃ratorum—*empereor*.

Here is a word, and the only one, which seems to clash with our law. There would be no phonetic difficulties in **empereor*. The word in its nominative form *imperator*, *emperere* troubled Mr. Darmesteter,²⁹ from its retention of the protonic, the *e* in question. The explanation, however, is very simple. *Imperatorem* seemed to the popular mind—and probably correctly—as much a compound of *in* as, for example, *impedicare*, and so the accent was *imp̃erat̃orem*, and the *e* remained.

2. *Words in which the second pretonic syllable is lost.*

²⁷ For these, see the appendix.

²⁸ Cf. Körting, *Wörterbuch*, 5887.

²⁹ *l. c.*, p. 149: "emperere . . . est une véritable anomalie."

*Dominicellum—dameisel.

This word must be excluded, since the Folk-Latin form was *domnus*, *i* falling between *m-n*; the compound would naturally be built on the popular form. This explains the presence of the *e* in *dameisel*, the *mn* requiring a supporting vowel.

Pūtīditatem—puteé,³⁰ nitīditatem—neteeé,³⁰ *arboriscellum—arbroissel, *nidificare—nicher, *planiturosum—plantureux,³¹ *auctoricare—ot-tieier.³²

3. Words compounded with prepositions.

This list includes only those compounded forms which have not the simplex as an independent word in French. In every case the development indicates that the secondary accent was on the first syllable of the last member.

*Allecticare—allecher, *apprivitiare—apprivoiser, *assēditare—assetter, *attitulare(?)—atteler, *delābulare—délābrer, *exfundulare—effondrer, *expādicare—épancher, *expūliciare—épucer, *expāventare—épaventer, *extrādicare—esraichier, impēdicare—empêcher, intaminare—entamer, *imprūmutuare—emprunter, interrogare—enterver, recuperare—recouvrer, reprobicare—reprocher, ad mēnt(em) habere amentevōir.³³

4. Words conforming to the accent law but furnishing only negative evidence, since they are explicable by analogy:

*Aureleanensis—Orlénois, (cf. Orléans), *Vigilantivus—Veillantif, (cf. veiller), *expilūcare—éplucher (cf. expilūcat),³⁴ *pediticūlare—pétiller (cf. pediticulat), *movitinare—mutiner³⁵ (cf. movitinat), *sollīcitare—soucier (cf. sollicitat), jolatoreum—jogleor (cf. nom. joglere), predicatorum—prêcheur (cf. prêcher), semina-

³⁰ For the seeming exception to Darmesteter's Law, cf. Darnes., *l. c.*, p. 150.

³¹ The *u* in this word presents a violation of Darmesteter's Law that indicates it is half-learned.

³² This word seems to indicate that the second pretonic fell before the protonic. This last then remains as a supporting vowel. Mr. Darmesteter, *l. c.*, p. 153, explains the word from a third pers. sing. *auctoricat*, but there is no sufficient reason for the accent in this form to rest on the penult.

³³ Cited because the parts do not develop as if they were separate words.

³⁴ Where the *i*, being pretonic, falls.

³⁵ For the *u*, cf. *mutin*.

torem—semeur (cf. semer), medicamentum,—megement, *medicaticium, megeis, *medicatrissam,—megerisse (cf. meges).

5. Words that throw no light on the question, but offer no opposition to initial accentuation.

Cōnquīsitōnem—cuisençon, *gravamentare—guermenter, *invōlūtūare—enveloppeur, oripēlargum—orpres, aedificare—aigier, fructificare—frotigier, *frigidulosum—frileux.

The last word, in spite of its irregularity, would point to initial accent were it not that we should write it **frigidulosum* (cf. dominicellum, *supra*, col. 359, l. 1, and so it has only two pretonic syllables.

Our discussion thus far has included only words with three pretonic syllables. What of those that have more? I have found only five such words, and they are worthless as test words:

*Apparicūlare—appareiller (cf. pareil), *pediticūlare—pétiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), *expediticūlare—épouiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), *exaequacūlare—égailler (cf. 3rd person sing.), *excollūbicare—escolorgier (cf. 3rd person sing.).

We have now completed the list of words that bear on the question and find that the law fits all cases arising under it. But, after all, its main feature, initial accent, was announced by Mr. Meyer-Lübke several years ago. Yet it is since then that Darmesteter's grammar, positing binary accent, appeared, and that Schwan, in the second edition of his grammar, reasserted his theory. In view of this, and especially as none of the evidence in the matter had been given, I have deemed this examination of the question justifiable. If it has confirmed one of the theories already announced, I am glad that such is the case rather than to add a new theory to the list already too large.

E. C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

CONTEMPORARY FRENCH LITERATURE.

Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine, by GEORGES PELLISSIER. Paris: 1895. 18mo, 382 pp.